arXiv:0801.4965v1 [math.QA] 31 Jan 2008

A simple algorithm for extending the identities for quantum minors to the multiparametric case

Zoran Škoda, `zskoda@irb.hr`

Abstract. *For any homogeneous identity between q-minors, we provide an identity between P, Q-minors.*

1. ([1, 2, 8]) Suppose we are given $n \times n$ matrices $P = (p_{ij})$ and $Q = (q_{ij})$ with invertible entries in the ground field $\mathbf{k}$, for which there exist q such that

$$p_{ij}q_{ij} = q^2, q_{ij} = q_{ji}^{-1}, \quad i < j, \text{ and } \ q_{ii} = p_{ii}, \text{ for all } i. \tag{1}$$

Define an associative algebra $\mathcal{M}(P, Q; \mathbf{k}, n) := \mathbf{k}\langle T^i_j, i, j = 1, \ldots, n\rangle / I$, where I is the ideal spanned by the relations

$$\begin{array}{ll}
T^k_i T^k_j = q_{ij} T^k_j T^k_i, & i < j \\
T^k_i T^l_i = p_{kl} T^l_i T^k_i, & k < l \\
q_{ij} T^k_j T^l_i = p_{kl} T^l_i T^k_j, & i < j, k < l \\
T^k_i T^l_j - q_{ij} q_{kl}^{-1} T^l_j T^k_i = (q_{ij} - p_{ij}^{-1}) T^k_j T^l_i, & i < j, k < l
\end{array}$$

$\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}(P, Q; \mathbf{k}, n)$ is a bialgebra with respect to the "matrix" comultiplication which is the unique algebra homomorphism $\Delta : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{M}$ extending the formulas $\Delta T^i_j = \sum T^i_k \otimes T^k_j$ with counit $\epsilon T^i_j = \delta^i_j$ (Kronecker delta). The bialgebra $\mathcal{M}$ is called the **multiparametric quantum linear group**.

Our conventions differ a bit from the cited references: we treat p-s and q-s symmetrically in the sense that if we interchange rows and columns of matrix T and if we simultaneously interchange P and Q, we obtain an isomorphic algebra. If $P = Q$ and $q_{ij} = q$ for $i < j$ and $q_{ij} = q^{-1}$ for $i > j$, then $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_q(\mathbf{k})$ (1-parametric quantized matrix bialgebra). In this paper, we will denote by t^i_j the generators for 1-parametric case.

2. (*Labels.*) It is convenient to consider that the row and column labels belong to some totally ordered set of labels, not necessarily the set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. The main reason is that one often needs to treat some subsets of the set of labels and the corresponding submatrices of the matrix $T = (T^i_j)$.

3. The quantum Q-space $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}^n_Q)$, quantum P-space $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}^n_P)$, q- normalized Q-space $S_r(q, Q)$, dual q- normalized Q- space $S_l(q, Q)$, right P-exterior algebra

Λ_P, and left Q-exterior algebra Λ_Q, are the algebras *defined* by generators and relations as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l}
\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}^n_Q) := \mathbf{k}\langle x^i, i=1,\ldots,n\rangle/\langle x^i x^j - q_{ij}x^j x^i, i<j\rangle \\
\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}^n_P) := \mathbf{k}\langle y_i, i=1,\ldots,n\rangle/\langle y_i y_j - p_{ij}y_j y_i, i<j\rangle\rangle \\
S_r(q,Q) := \mathbf{k}\langle r_1,\ldots,r_n\rangle/\langle r_i r_j - qq_{ij}^{-1}r_j r_i,\ \ i<j\rangle \\
S_l(q,Q) := \mathbf{k}\langle l^1,\ldots,l^n\rangle/\langle l^i l^j - q_{ij}q^{-1}l^j l^i,\ \ i<j\rangle \\
\Lambda_P := \mathbf{k}\langle e^1,\ldots,e^n\rangle/\langle e^i e^j + p_{ij}^{-1}e^j e^i,\, i<j,\, (e^i)^2\rangle \\
\Lambda_Q := \mathbf{k}\langle e_1,\ldots,e_n\rangle/\langle f_i f_j + q_{ij}^{-1}f_j f_i,\, i<j,\, (f_i)^2\rangle
\end{array} \tag{2}$$

We note after MANIN (e.g. [7, 8]) the simple fact that $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}^n_Q), \Lambda_Q$ are right and $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}^n_P), \Lambda_P$ are left comodule algebras over $\mathcal{M}$ via coactions $\rho, \rho_\Lambda, \rho', \rho'_\Lambda$ which are the unique coactions which are algebra maps and extend formulas $\rho(x^i) = \sum_j x^j \otimes T^i_j$, $\rho_\Lambda(e^i) = \sum_j e^j \otimes T^i_j$, $\rho'(y_j) = \sum_i T^i_j \otimes y_i$ and $\rho'_\Lambda(f_j) = \sum_i T^i_j \otimes f_i$.

4. Tuples of labels will be called *multilabels*. Let $L = (l_1,\ldots,l_r)$, $K = (k_1,\ldots,k_s)$. The concatenation will be denoted by juxtaposition: $LK = (l_1,\ldots,l_r,k_1,\ldots,k_s)$. Usually the multilabels will be (ascendingly) ordered to start with and $\hat{L}$ denotes the ordered complement of a submultilabel L (usually in $\{1,\ldots,n\}$). By placing the multilabel within the colons, we will denote its ascendingly ordered version. For example, if K and L are ordered, then KL is not necessarily ordered, because some labels in L may be smaller than some labels in K. However $:KL:$ is the multilabel obtained from KL by permuting the labels until they are ascendingly ordered. We identify the notation for a single label j and the multilabel (j), and in this vein $\hat{j} = \widehat{(j)}$ is the same as multilabel $(1,2,\ldots,j-1,j+1,\ldots,n)$.

We use obvious exponent notation: $r^J := r^{j_1}\cdots r^{j_n}$ and alike.

5. Algebras (2) satisfy the obvious normal basis ("PBW type") theorems: fix an order on generators, then the monomials ordered compatibly with this order form a vector space basis ("PBW basis"), for example $x_1^{a_1}x_2^{a_2}\cdots x_n^{a_n}$ in the case of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}^n_Q)$; however, no higher exponents than 1 appear in the bases for Λ_P and Λ_Q because $e_i^2 = 0$.

Passing from arbitrary words in generators to the basis elements clearly reduces to reordering the generators, and accumulating the proportionality constants. Let us introduce the notation for those rearrangements factors which will be needed below. The following are the defining properties of coefficient functions $\epsilon_P, \epsilon_Q, \zeta_r, \zeta_l$ from sets of multilabels to $\mathbf{k}$:

$$\begin{array}{ll} e_J := \epsilon_P(J) e_{:J:}, & r_J := \zeta_r(J) r_{:J:}, \\ f_J := \epsilon_Q(J) f_{:J:}, & l_J := \zeta_l(J) l_{:J:}, \end{array}$$

where $\epsilon_P(J), \epsilon_Q(J)$ are defined only when J has no repeted labels inside, but ζ_r and ζ_l are defined even for multilabels with repetition. The following is obvious:

$$\zeta_r(k_1, \ldots, k_s) = \prod_{i<j, k_i>k_j} q^{-1} q_{k_i k_j}$$

$$\zeta_l(k_1, \ldots, k_s) = \prod_{i<j, k_i>k_j} q q^{-1}_{k_i k_j} = \zeta_r^{-1}(k_1, \ldots, k_s)$$

Clearly, if J is ascendingly ordered multilabel with out repetitions, then

$$\begin{array}{lclcl} \epsilon_P(\sigma J) & = & (-q)^{-l(\sigma)} \zeta_r(\sigma J) & = & \prod_{k<l, \sigma(k)>\sigma(l)} (-p_{j_{\sigma(k)} j_{\sigma(l)}}), \\ \epsilon_Q(\sigma J) & = & (-q)^{l(\sigma)} \zeta_l(\sigma J) & = & \prod_{k<l, \sigma(k)>\sigma(l)} (-q_{j_{\sigma(k)} j_{\sigma(l)}}), \end{array}$$

(recall that $(q_{ij})^{-1} = q_{ji}$).

6. (*Gradings.*) Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the set of labels of generators of $S_r = S_r(q, Q)$ (they label rows!). Let $\mathcal{J}$ be the set of labels of generators of $S_l = S_l(q, Q)$ (they label columns!). Both sets are bijective to $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. Thus the free Abelian group $\mathbf{Z}[\mathcal{I}]$ is isomorphic to $\mathbf{Z}^n$ (and could be naturally identified with the weight lattice for SL_n). Now we assign $\mathbf{Z}[\mathcal{I}]$–$\mathbf{Z}[\mathcal{J}]$ bigrading to algebras $S_l(q, Q)$, $S_r(q, Q)$ and $\mathcal{M}_q(\mathbf{k})$. If $i_1, \ldots, i_n, j_1, \ldots, j_n$ are the elements of $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$, then a bidegree is a formal sum of the form $a_1 i_1 + \ldots + a_n i_n + b_1 j_1 + \ldots b_n j_n$, e.g. $-i_3 + 2i_4 + j_3$, and we may separate the $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ grading with comma for clarity, e.g. $(-i_3 + 2i_4, \, j_3) \equiv -i_3 + 2i_4 + j_3$. We assign the bidegree $(-i, 0)$ to the generator r_i of S_l (notice the negative sign!) $\mathbf{Z}\langle \mathcal{I}^* \rangle$-degree to zero and similarly the dual prescription $(0, -j)$ to l^j of S_r. We also assign the bidegree $(+i, +j)$ to each generator t^i_j of the 1-parametric algebra $\mathcal{M}_q(\mathbf{k})$. The defining ideals are bihomogeneous hence we extend this prescription multiplicatively to a bigrading on the algebras $S_l(q, Q)$, $S_r(q, Q)$ and $\mathcal{M}_q(\mathbf{k})$.

7. Notation. Consider the tensor product of bigraded algebras

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}} := S_l(q, Q) \otimes \mathcal{M}_q(\mathbf{k}) \otimes S_r(q, Q). \qquad (3)$$

8. Lemma. *Any (bi)homogenous element in a tensor product of (bi)graded algebras is a sum of tensor products of (bi)homogenous elements in tensor factors. If one chooses a set of homogeneous generators in each tensor factor than the summands can be chosen as tensor products of monomials in those generators.*

9. Lemma. $l^j \otimes t^i_j \otimes r_i$ *generate the subalgebra of all elements of bidegree* $(0,0)$ *in* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$.

Proof. If $J = (j_1, \ldots, j_s)$ is some ordered s-tuple of labels (repetitions of labels possible) denote $l^J = l^{j_1} \cdots l^{j_s}$ and we adopt obvious extension of this multilabel notation for r-s and t-s. It is clear that any tensor product of monomials which is of bidegree $(0,0)$ is of the form $l^{\tau I} \otimes t^J_I \otimes r_{\sigma J}$ where σ and τ are permutations on $|I| = |J|$ letters. Then by lemma **8** it is enough to show that any such tensor product $l^{\tau I} \otimes t^J_I \otimes r_{\sigma J}$ may be written as sum of products of the form $l^j \otimes t^i_j \otimes r_i$. But l^J and $l^{\tau J}$ are proportional in S_l, and similarly r_I and $r_{\sigma I}$ are proportional in S_r. Hence, up to accounting for a scalar factor, we may assume that σ and τ are trivial. But then the expression is manifestly the product of elements of the required form.

10. Theorem. *Suppose (1) holds. Let* t^i_j *and* T^i_j *denote the generators of* q*-deformed and* P,Q*-deformed quantum matrix algebras respectively. Then*

(i) the rule

$$\iota_{q,Q} : T^i_j \mapsto l^j \otimes t^i_j \otimes r_i \tag{4}$$

extends to a unique algebra homomorphism $\iota_{q,Q} : \mathcal{M}(P,Q;\mathbf{k}) \to \widehat{\mathcal{M}}$.

(ii) This homomorphism is injective and its image is the subalgebra of all elements of $(0,0)$*-bidegree in* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$.

(iii) Similarly, rescaling e^j *by* l^j *produces the relations in* Λ_P *from the relations in* Λ_q.

Proof. (i) One needs to show that $\iota_{q,Q}$ sends the ideal of relations (in free algebra on T-s) to zero. For example, omitting the tensor product notation, we calculate, for $i < j$ and $k < l$,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \iota(q_{kl} T^i_l T^j_k) & = & q_{kl} l^l t^i_l r_i \cdot l^k t^j_k r_j \\ & = & q_{kl} (l^l l^k)(t^i_l t^j_k)(r_i r_j) \\ & = & q_{kl} (q q_{kl}^{-1} l^k l^l)(t^j_k t^i_l)(q q_{ij}^{-1} r_j r_i) \\ & = & q^2 q_{ij}^{-1} l^k l^l t^j_k t^i_l r_j r_i \\ & = & \iota(p_{ij} T^j_k T^i_l). \end{array}$$

The other cases are left to the reader.

(ii) For injectivity one can use e.g. the normal basis theorem for the quantum matrix algebras: monomials of the form $(T^1_1)^{\alpha_{11}}(T^1_1)^{\alpha_{12}}\cdots(T^1_1)^{\alpha_{nn}}$ make a basis of $\mathcal{M}(P,Q;\mathbf{k})$. It is clear that the images are linearly independent because the middle tensor factors of the images are such (by the normal basis theorem for 1-parametric case) and the other two tensor factors are nonzero. The description of the image of $\iota_{q,Q}$ follows from **9**.

(iii) Easy.

11. Remarks. This isomorphism will be very useful for our purpose. Essentially this proposition is a mechanism essentially equivalent to the cocycle-twisting of [1]. Namely, in both approaches, the difference between the algebra relations for t^i_j-s and for T^i_j-s is reflected in rescaling factors for each monomial, which may be expressed in terms of a bicharacter and depends only on the bidegree of the monomial.

However, there is an important difference in using our isomorphism ι from the usage of twisting in [1]. Namely, it is shown in [1] that the correspondence $t^i_j \mapsto T^i_j$ which they use, extends multiplicatively on monomials to an isomorphisms of vector spaces, and even of coalgebras; whereas it does not respect the algebra structure. On the other hand, our map ι is a monomorphism of algebras, as stated above, but it does not respect the coalgebra structure!

12. (*Quantum minors.*) If J and K are ascendingly ordered row and column multilabels of the same cardinality m without repetitions, then the corresponding quantum minor D^K_L is the element of $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying

$$D^K_L = \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(m)} \epsilon_P(\sigma K) T^{k_{\sigma 1}}_{l_1}\cdots T^{k_{\sigma m}}_{l_m} = \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(m)} \epsilon_P(\sigma K)\epsilon_P^{-1}(\tau L) T^{k_{\sigma 1}}_{l_{\tau 1}}\cdots T^{k_{\sigma m}}_{l_{\tau m}}$$

$$D^K_L = \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(m)} \epsilon_Q(\sigma L) T^{k_1}_{l_{\sigma 1}}\cdots T^{l_{\sigma m}}_{k_m} = \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(m)} \epsilon_Q(\sigma L)\epsilon_Q^{-1}(\tau K) T^{k_{\tau 1}}_{l_{\sigma 1}}\cdots T^{k_{\tau m}}_{l_{\sigma m}}$$

where $\tau \in \Sigma(m)$ is a fixed permutation.

13. Proposition. *Let ι be the monomorphism (4). Then $\iota(D^K_J) = l^J d^K_J r_K$ where d^K_J denotes the quantum minor in 1-parametric case.*

Proof.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\iota(D^K_J) & = & \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(m)}(-q)^{l(\sigma)}\zeta_r(\sigma K)\iota(T^{k\sigma(1)}_{j_1})\cdots\iota(T^{k\sigma(m)}_{j_m}) \\
& = & \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(m)}(-q)^{l(\sigma)} l^{j_1} l^{j_2}\ldots l^{j_m} \otimes t^{k\sigma(1)}_{j_1}\cdots t^{k\sigma(m)}_{j_m} \otimes \zeta_r(\sigma K) r_{k_1}\cdots r_{k_m} \\
& = & \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(m)}(-q)^{l(\sigma)} l^{j_1} l^{j_2}\ldots l^{j_m} \otimes t^{k\sigma(1)}_{j_1}\cdots t^{k\sigma(m)}_{j_m} \otimes r_{k\sigma(1)}\cdots r_{k\sigma(m)} \\
& = & l^J D^K_J r_K.
\end{array}$$

This proposition reminds but is different to the statement of Lemma 5 in [1] which asserts that the twisting considered as an identity map but changing its algebra structure, interchanges the quantum determinants. Notice that the D^K_L and d^K_L on the two sides are given by different formulas in terms of generators T^k_l and t^k_l respectively.

14. Now one needs to see what happens when one considers monomials in D-s, for example $\iota(D^K_L D^M_N)$. By the same, method, one gets $(l^L l^M)(d^K_L d^M_N)(r_K r_M)$. One knows that the relations in $\mathcal{M}$ are homogeneous in the sense that the total row multilabel and column multilabel are the same up to the ordering. Every relation is a sum of homogeneous. Now if we take different monomials $\prod d^*_* = d^{K_1}_{L_1} \cdots d^{K_m}_{L_m}$ in usual quantum minors then in order to make them manifestly in the image of ι on some monomial in multiparametric quantum minors, we need to homogenize expression by multiplying it by l^S and r_V where S and V are the ascendingly ordered column and row total multilabel of $\prod d^*_*$, that is $S =: K_1 \cdots K_m :$ and $V =: L_1 \cdots L_m :$. *Thus the S and V are the same for all monomials in the identity (this is more or less the definition of a homogeneous identity).* Then we reorder the multilabels in l and in r separately to get the same ordering, but this involves introducing inverse of ζ_l and ζ_r corresponding to the ordering on the column and row multilabels seperately. For a homogeneous identity the multiplier l^S and r_V will be the same, however the reordering factors will be clearly different. Thus we get, in terms of D-s the same identity up to different homogeneous factors in front of different monomials will be $\zeta_l^{-1}(L_1 L_2 \cdots L_m)\zeta_r^{-1}(K_1 K_2 \cdots K_m)$ where K_i-s is the row multilabel of i-th row and L_i of i-th column.

Theorem. *This procedure induces the 1-1 correspondence between the quantum minor identities for the 1-parametric and the minor identities for multiparametric minors.*

Notice that despite the fact that ι is not an algebra homomorphism, essentially ι and extracting the proprotionality constants from reorderings of r-s and l-s do the job. If one would use the original twisting of [1] one has there a *coalgebra map*, hence it sends identities to something what are not, hence it is not clear how to directly use it for the same result.

References

[1] M. Artin, W. Schelter, J. Tate, *Quantum deformations of GL_n*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. XLIV, 879–895 (1991)

[2] E. E. Demidov, *Multiparameter quantum deformations of the group* GL(n)*. (Russian) Uspehi Mat. Nauk 46 (1991), no. 4(280), pp. 147–148; translation in Russian Math. Surveys 46 (1991), no. 4, pp. 169–171.*

[3] I. M. Gel'fand, V. S. Retakh, *Quasideterminants I*, Selecta Mathematica, New Series 3 (1997) no.4, pp. 517–546; `q-alg/9705026`.

[4] M. Hashimoto, T. Hayashi, *Quantum multilinear algebra*, Tôhoku Math J. 44 (1992), pp. 471-521.

[5] D. Krob, B. Leclerc, *Minor identities for quasi-determinants and quantum determinants*, Comm.Math.Phys. 169 (1995), pp. 1–23.

[6] V. A. Lunts, A. L. Rosenberg, *Localization for quantum groups*, Selecta Math. (N. S.) 5 (1999), no. 1, pp. 123–159.

[7] Yu. I. Manin, *Quantum groups and non-commutative geometry*, CRM, Montreal 1988.

[8] Yu. I. Manin, *Multiparametric quantum deformation of the general linear supergroup*, Comm. Math. Phys. 123 (1989), pp. 163–175.

[9] B. Parshall, J. Wang, *Quantum linear groups*, Memoirs AMS 439, 1991.

[10] Z. Škoda, *Included-row exchange principle for quantum minors*, `math.QA/0510512`

[11] Z. Škoda, *Localizations for construction of quantum coset spaces*, "Noncommutative geometry and quantum groups" (conf. Warszawa 2001), P. M. Hajac, W. Pusz eds. Banach Center Publications vol.61, pp. 265–298, Polish Acad. Sci. Warszawa 2003; `arXiv:math.QA/0301090`.